

Parrondo Games and Quantum Algorithms

Chiu Fan Lee* and Neil Johnson†

Center for Quantum Computation and Physics Department
Clarendon Laboratory, Oxford University
Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PU, U.K.

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We pursue the possible connections between classical games and quantum computation. The Parrondo game is one in which a random combination of two losing games produces a winning game. We introduce novel realizations of this Parrondo effect in which the player can ‘win’ via random reflections and rotations of the state-vector, and connect these to known quantum algorithms.

*c.lee1@physics.ox.ac.uk

†n.johnson@physics.ox.ac.uk

The possibility of ‘winning by losing’ is obviously appealing. This was the idea behind the Brownian ratchet studied by Feynmann [1]. Although one cannot ‘win’ against the Second Law of Thermodynamics, a discrete-time version of this phenomenon can be interpreted as a gambling game. In particular, Parrondo and co-workers showed that two losing classical games, A and B, could be combined to create a winning game [2]. In a separate development, the field of quantum games is currently attracting much attention because of the underlying theme of information processing [3]. But of what possible use are such quantum games? It is hoped they might offer some deeper insight into quantum complexity and, specifically, the design of new quantum algorithms [4, 5]. However this hope is still little more than speculation.

In this paper, we consider the Parrondo effect in the quantum domain and provide an interesting connection between this phenomenon and known quantum algorithms. The Parrondo effect allows a player to profit from randomness (i.e. noise) - hence it has possible practical relevance in the stochastic control of quantum algorithms [6] and in controlling quantum decoherence [7]. Two very different implementations of the Parrondo idea have recently been proposed for quantum games, with spatial state-dependence [8] and historical state-dependence [9]. We note however that the latter implementation did not consider random switching between the two losing quantum games; moreover, neither implementation made an explicit connection to quantum algorithms. In this paper we make such a connection, by explicitly focussing on the effect of random rotations and reflections on the relevant state-vector.

We start by reviewing the Parrondo effect, but using a novel realization in terms of rotating vectors. Such a viewpoint makes sense given that our objective is to connect up with quantum algorithms: such quantum algorithms can be thought of geometrically in terms of rotation/reflection operations on the state-vector within the Bloch sphere [10]. Comparing to previous realizations of classical Parrondo’s games, our rotating-vector realization produces a much higher winning rate for the combined game ($A \oplus B$) even though the losing rates for games A and B are greater. This improvement is achieved at the expense of having to keep track of more states. We note that Parrondo games are one-person games, hence the present discussions only refer to ‘the player’ (in contrast to the quantum games of Refs. [3, 4]).

Game A: Consider a wheel with a vector drawn from the center to the circumference, i.e. the vector is a radial line. Suppose the vector is originally vertical (i.e. $\theta = 0$) and the player plays by calling a robot (A) to rotate the wheel. The robot can only rotate the wheel by 0,

$2\pi/3$ or $4\pi/3$ radians, with equal probabilities. The player wins if the vector ends up in the upper-half of the circle (i.e. $-\pi/2 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2$) and he loses otherwise. The game is continued by rotating the wheel from the previous position, i.e. without restoring the vector to the vertical position. The stationary states are such that the vector will end up at $\theta = 0, 2\pi/3$ or $4\pi/3$ with equal probabilities. Therefore this game is losing for the player and the rate of losing is $1/3$. In Parrondo's original game, the losing rate is smaller (i.e. -2ϵ where $\epsilon \ll 1$).

Game B: This is the same as game A, except that the robot (B) can now only rotate the wheel by $0, 2\pi/7, 4\pi/7, 6\pi/7, 8\pi/7, 10\pi/7, 12\pi/7$, with equal probabilities. Similar analysis as that for game A shows the player's losing rate is $1/7$. In Parrondo's original game, the losing rate is again smaller (i.e. $-11\epsilon/5$ where $\epsilon \ll 1$).

Game $A \oplus B$: The player now plays a combined game in which he randomly selects either A or B at each timestep. Operationally, one of the robots A or B is selected at random to rotate the wheel at each timestep. Simple geometric analysis shows that the vector can now end up in $3 \times 7 = 21$ different orientations, 11 of which are winning. The corresponding 21×21 transition matrix is doubly-stochastic and so the stationary distribution will be equally distributed among these 21 positions. Therefore the player now wins with probability $11/21 \approx 0.5238 > 1/2$. In Parrondo's original game, the winning rate was $1/80 - 21\epsilon/10$ as compared to the present, larger rate of $1/21$. It turns out there is nothing special about the numbers 3 and 7 chosen for this implementation. The games A and B are originally losing simply because $3 = 7 = 3 \bmod 4$, and the combined game becomes winning because $3 \times 7 = 1 \bmod 4$. Therefore, the above vector-rotating implementation of Parrondo's effect works equally well for all m, n such that $(m, n) = 1$ and $m = n = 3 \bmod 4$. By the same method, we can therefore construct two losing games with rates $-1/m < 0$ and $-1/n < 0$ such that when they are combined at random, we obtain a winning game with rate $1/mn > 0$. One could also extend the Parrondo scheme to include random combinations of *any even* number of games. We therefore conclude that random rotations of a vector can be used to 'win', in the same spirit as the original Parrondo effect.

Can we construct similar situations in the quantum domain in which we can also 'win' using randomly-chosen symmetry operations on the state-vector, and can we expect these 'games' to have a close connection with quantum algorithms? After all, a quantum state is by definition a normalized vector in the corresponding Hilbert space and a quantum computation can be seen as a series of rotations/reflections

applied to the original state. We now proceed to show that this is indeed the case, and that there is indeed an interesting connection to quantum algorithms. We speculate that such a connection could, in principle, provide a starting point for uncovering new quantum algorithms - the systematic generation of such algorithms is one of the great outstanding problems in quantum computing.

Our first example of the Parrondo effect in the quantum domain, is related to the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm for guessing a number [11, 4]. Any rotation can be seen as a reflection about a specific plane, hence for convenience our discussions will be couched in the language of reflections. The goal of the game is to obtain (i.e. measure with a high probability) a final state $|\alpha\rangle$ starting from an initial state $|0 \cdots 0\rangle$ [4]. The player must play this game for as few timesteps as possible: he has at his disposal only two types of operation, each of which corresponds to an oracle. The first corresponds to the following operation:

$$\hat{O}|x\rangle = (-1)^{x \cdot \alpha}|x\rangle$$

where $x \cdot \alpha$ denotes the bit-wise inner product modulo 2 [10]. However there is a catch for the player: this oracle is ‘noisy’. In particular, the operation $\hat{O}$ is only performed for *half* the computational basis, hence

$$\hat{O}|x\rangle = \begin{cases} (-1)^{x \cdot \alpha}|x\rangle \\ |x\rangle \end{cases}$$

with equal probability. The second oracle is reliable, and corresponds to applying the operator $H^{\otimes n}$. Following Ref. [11], if both oracles were noiseless then the player could obtain $|\alpha\rangle$ in only three timesteps via the sequence $H^{\otimes n}\hat{O}H^{\otimes n}$. Suppose instead the player plays this sequence using the noisy oracle. Applying the noisy $\hat{O}$ operator is the same as reflecting $|\psi\rangle := \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}}|x\rangle$ about all $|y\rangle$ such that $y \cdot \alpha = 1$ at random. If the player were to play this ‘game’ of reflection for each y separately, it would only increase his chances of measuring α by a very small amount. Indeed, the chance of measuring α becomes $O(1/2^n)$. Now we explore what would happen if the player combines all these ‘games’ together. Assuming $\alpha \neq 0$, then $\#\{y|y \cdot \alpha = 1\} = 2^{n-1}$ hence

$$\hat{O}H^{\otimes n}|0 \cdots 0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n + 2^n}} \left[\sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^{x \cdot \alpha}|x\rangle + 2|y_1\rangle + \cdots + 2|y_{2^{n-2}}\rangle \right].$$

It can be shown that the probability of measuring α is now given by

$$|\langle \alpha | H^{\otimes n} \hat{O} H^{\otimes n} | 0 \cdots 0 \rangle|^2 > 1/8$$

which represents a very substantial improvement over the previous value of $O(1/2^n)$. In the spirit of the Parrondo effect, well-controlled

randomness has been exploited for profit such that the player now ‘wins’.

We now present a quantum Parrondo game which can be viewed as a vector-rotating game, and is related to Grover’s search algorithm [12]. The player’s goal is to obtain (i.e. measure with a high probability) a fixed, unknown number α in as few timesteps as possible, where $0 \leq \alpha \leq 2^n - 1$. The initial state has the form $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} |x\rangle$. In this game, an infinite sequence of operators $\hat{O}_1 \cdots \hat{O}_m \cdots$ will be applied to $|\psi\rangle$. The player decides when to stop the sequence, i.e. he has the freedom to choose m such that $|\psi_f\rangle = \hat{O}_m \cdots \hat{O}_1 |\psi\rangle$. The payoff is then determined by a measurement in the computational basis of $|\psi_f\rangle$. The game is winning if the player possesses a strategy that wins with probability $> 1/2$, and is losing otherwise. This game incorporates strategic moves, since the set of strategies used by the player to decide the duration of the game are equivalent to the set of natural numbers $\mathbf{N}$.

Game A: Here $\hat{O}_i = \hat{A}$ for all i , where $\hat{A}(|x\rangle) = (-1)^{\delta_{x\alpha}} |x\rangle$. Geometrically, $\hat{A}$ reflects the vector $|\psi\rangle$ about $|\alpha\rangle$. Since $\hat{A}^2 = I$, the player’s freedom in choosing when to stop the game will always reduce to just one of the following two scenarios: $|\psi_f\rangle = \hat{A}|\psi\rangle$ or $|\psi_f\rangle = |\psi\rangle$. Unfortunately for the player, the payoff $|\langle\alpha|\hat{A}|\psi\rangle|^2 = |\langle\alpha|\psi\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{2^n}$ which is less than $1/2$ for $n \geq 2$. Therefore the player does not possess a winning strategy, hence game A is losing for him.

Game B: Here $\hat{O}_i = \hat{B}$ for all i , where $\hat{B} := 2|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| - I$. Geometrically, $\hat{B}$ reflects $|\psi\rangle$ about itself. Again, the player has the freedom to decide how many $\hat{B}$ are applied to the input state before measurement. However since $\hat{B}|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$, the player can have no influence in determining the payoff in this game. The game is hence losing for him because the payoff $|\langle\alpha|\psi\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{2^n}$ which is less than $1/2$.

Game $A \oplus B$: The player combines games A and B at random. By this we mean $\hat{O}_i = \hat{A}$ or $\hat{B}$ with equal probability, and the player is told the sequence as it unfolds. Once again, the player has the freedom to decide when to stop the sequence and hence do the measurement. Since $\hat{A}^2 = \hat{B}^2 = I$ and $\hat{B}|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$, any given finite sequence $\hat{O}_i$ will always produce a final state with the following form: $|\psi_f\rangle = (\hat{B})\hat{A}\hat{B} \cdots \hat{A}\hat{B}\hat{A}|\psi\rangle$. For all $k \in \mathbf{Z}$, there will *almost surely* [13] be an $m(k) \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_f\rangle &= \hat{O}_{m(k)} \cdots \hat{O}_1 |\psi\rangle \\ &= \overbrace{(\hat{B}\hat{A}) \cdots (\hat{B}\hat{A})}^k |\psi\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

A winning strategy for the player is therefore to choose $m(k)$ such that

$k = \lceil \pi\sqrt{2^n}/4 \rceil$. By stopping after the $m(k)$ -th operation, it can be shown that the player will then win with probability $> 1/2$. As such an $m(k)$ exists almost surely [13], we see that this combined game is winning for the player. It can also be seen that $\hat{B} \circ \hat{A} = \hat{G}$ where $\hat{G}$ is Grover's operator [12, 10]. Thus we have produced a Parrondo effect whereby the player benefits from randomness to win, and have connected this effect to a well-known quantum algorithm.

Throughout this paper we have discussed combinations of games, each of which constitutes particular strategies. One could argue that the *combined* game $(A \oplus B)$ is the true game, and that the 'games' A and B are just strategies in this larger game chosen in some (random) sequence. This is just a semantic point, and could also be made against much of the Parrondo game literature. In order to make direct connection with this literature and community, we prefer to regard the combined game $A \oplus B$ as a (random) sequence of games A and B rather than a (random) sequence of strategies. The physical results and implications are unchanged by such shifts in verbal definitions.

To summarize, we have discussed connections between quantum games and quantum algorithms whereby the performance can be improved by profiting from randomness. The counter-intuitive conclusion is that such randomness/noise can be of direct use in the quantum regime. We hope that the present results serve to stimulate further work in this on-going field.

CFL thanks NSERC (Canada), ORS (U.K.) and Clarendon Fund (Oxford) for financial supports. NFJ thanks EPSRC for a travel grant, and is grateful to L. Quiroga, F. Rodriguez and D. Abbott for discussions.

References

- [1] R.P. Feynmann, R.B. Leighton and M. Sands, *The Feynmann Lectures on Physics* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1963) Vol. 1.
- [2] J. Parrondo, G. Harmer and D. Abbott, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 5226 (2000); G.P. Harmer and C. Abbott, Nature **402** 846 (1999).
- [3] D.A. Meyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1052 (1999); J. Eisert, M. Wilkens and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3077 (1999); S.C. Benjamin and P.M. Hayden, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 030301(R) (2001); A. Iqbal and A.H. Tour, Phys. Lett. A **280**, 249 (2001); J. Du, X. Xu, H. Li, X. Zhou and R. Han, quant-ph/0103004; A.P. Flitney and D. Abbott, quant-ph/0109035. For a noisy quantum game, see N.F. Johnson, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 020302(R) (2001). For an evolutionary quantum game, see R. Kay, N.F. Johnson and S.C. Benjamin, J. Phys. A **34**, L1 (2001).
- [4] D.A. Meyer, quant-ph/0004092.
- [5] See the discussion in Nature **414**, 244 (2001).
- [6] S. Maurer, T. Hogg and B. Huberman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 257901 (1999).
- [7] S. Mancini, D. Vitali, P. Tombesi and R. Bonifacio, quant-ph/0108011. See also C.F. Lee, F. Rodriguez, L. Quiroga and N.F. Johnson (in preparation).
- [8] D.A. Meyer and H. Blumer, quant-ph/0110028.
- [9] A.P. Flitney, J. Ng and D. Abbott, quant-ph/0201037.
- [10] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000) Chap. 6.
- [11] E. Bernstein and U. Vazirani, *Proceedings of the 25th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing* (New York, ACM Press, 1993), p. 11.
- [12] L.K. Grover, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 325 (1997).
- [13] An event E occurs almost surely if $\forall \epsilon > 0, \Pr(E) > 1 - \epsilon$.